APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,929	09/09/2003	Kevin Lym	SONY-26100	3117

7590   09/04/2008

Jonathan O. Owens
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP
162 North Wolfe Road
Sunnyvale, CA 94086

EXAMINER
MENDOZA, JUNIOR O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/04/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/658,929	LYM, KEVIN
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JUNIOR O. MENDOZA	2623	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _30 May 2008_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-51_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-51_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   **Claims 1, 5, 10, 11, 12, 16, 21, 41, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48 and 49** are rejected under

35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cazier (Pub No US 2003/0163467) in view

of Awbrey, Alicia; Spektor, Reena (http://www.apple.com/pr/library/2002/jul/17ipod.html)

July 17, 2002. Hereinafter referenced as Cazier and Awbrey, respectively.

        Regarding **claim 1**, Cazier discloses an apparatus for automatically routing

digital information, comprising:

        an interface coupled to receive downloaded digital information having a type (A

camera or storage transfers data, i.e. images to a computer or the internet once it gets

connected, where meta data is used to sort the files; paragraph [0014] also exhibited on

fig 1);

        a storage device coupled to the interface to store the digital information (A

computer receives the images or audio files from the camera, where the files are sorted

in sub-directories located on the computer's storage, paragraphs [0003], [0006] and

[0023]);

a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically sort and distribute the digital information based on the type (A processor configured to sort a plurality of files (i.e. images), see claim 11 in reference; moreover, when a camera is connected to a computer, files are automatically redistributed and sorted to different locations in memory (i.e. different folders) based on a predefined criteria, paragraphs [0006], [0013] and [0014]).

It is noted that Cazier fails to explicitly disclose that the digital information is distributed to one or more secondary devices. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Awbrey. In a similar field of endeavor Awbrey discloses that the digital information is distributed to one or more secondary devices (When a portable digital music player with Auto-sync, i.e. iPod, is connected to a computer, music content is automatically downloaded into the memory of the portable device, page 1 paragraph 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cazier by specifically providing such element, as taught by Awbrey, for the purpose of saving space on the main computer that receives the content, since it contains a limited amount of memory, whereas an unlimited amount of external storage devices can be connected at different times.

Regarding **claim 5**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as applied above (See claim 1); in addition, Awbrey discloses that the digital information comprises

media content including music, videos, and data (The iPod is a portable digital music player, where the music is also data, page 1 paragraph 3).

　　　Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cazier by specifically providing such element, as taught by Awbrey, for the purpose of supporting different types of content to be processed by the same device, which would motivate the user to buy a device capable of multitasking, sorting and distributing different types of data implementing the same device.

　　　Regarding **claim 10**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as applied above (See claim 1); in addition, Awbrey discloses that the controller automatically detects one or more secondary devices (The portable digital music player includes a build-in FireWire port in order to connect to a computer, which makes it a plug and play device, page 1 paragraph 3).

　　　Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cazier by specifically providing such element, as taught by Awbrey, for the purpose of allowing the external device to be able to work on any computer that supports PnP without the need to manually install any software which would allow it to work; moreover, this characteristic allows the device to be hot swappable.

Regarding **claim 11**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as applied above (See claim 1); in addition, Awbrey discloses that the secondary devices include one or more of an mp3 player, a video recorder, and a handheld (The iPod is a portable digital music player, page 1 paragraph 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cazier by specifically providing such element, as taught by Awbrey, for the purpose of supporting different types of content to be processed by the same device, which would motivate the user to buy a device capable of multitasking, sorting and distributing different types of data implementing the same device.

Regarding **claim 12**, Cazier discloses an apparatus for automatically routing digital information from a computing device to one or more secondary devices, comprising:

an interface coupled to receive downloaded digital information having a type (A camera or storage transfers data, i.e. images to a computer or the internet once it gets connected, where meta data is used to sort the files; paragraph [0014] also exhibited on fig 1);

storage device coupled to the interface to store the digital information (A computer receives the images or audio files from the camera, where the files are sorted in sub-directories located on the computer's storage, paragraphs [0003], [0006] and [0023]);

a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically determine which type of digital information is routed to which secondary device (A processor configured to sort a plurality of files (i.e. images), see claim 11 in reference; moreover, when a camera is connected to a computer, files are automatically redistributed and sorted to different locations in memory (i.e. different folders) based on a predefined criteria, paragraphs [0006], [0013] and [0014]; where the files can be sorted to a different location in memory based on the extension of each file as disclosed on paragraph [0022]);

a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically distribute the digital information to the one or more secondary devices based on the type (A processor configured to sort a plurality of files (i.e. images), see claim 11 in reference; moreover, when a camera is connected to a computer, files are automatically redistributed and sorted to different locations in memory (i.e. different folders) based on a predefined criteria, paragraphs [0006], [0013] and [0014]).

It is noted that Cazier fails to explicitly disclose a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically detect the one or more secondary devices. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Awbrey. In a similar field of endeavor Awbrey discloses a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically detect the one or more secondary devices (When a portable digital music player with Auto-sync, i.e. iPod, is connected to a computer, music content is automatically downloaded into the memory of the portable device,

where the portable digital music player includes a build-in FireWire port in order to

connect to a computer, which makes it a plug and play device, page 1 paragraph 3).

 Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify Cazier by specifically providing such element, as

taught by Awbrey, for the purpose of saving space on the main computer that receives

the content, since it contains a limited amount of memory, whereas an unlimited amount

of external storage devices can be connected at different times.

 Regarding **claim 16**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as above

(see claim 12); in addition, claim 16 incorporates all the limitations of claim 5. Therefore,

claim 16 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 5).

 Regarding **claim 21**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as above

(see claim 12); in addition, claim 21 incorporates all the limitations of claim 11.

Therefore, claim 21 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim

11).

 Regarding **claim 41**, Cazier discloses a method for routing digital information

from a computing device to one or more secondary devices, comprising:

 receiving the digital information having a type (A camera or storage transfers

data, i.e. images to a computer or the internet once it gets connected, where meta data

is used to sort the files; paragraph [0014] also exhibited on fig 1);

automatically sorting the digital information based on the type (A processor configured to sort a plurality of files (i.e. images), see claim 11 in reference; where the file extension can be used as a sorting criteria, paragraph [0022]);

and automatically distributing the digital information to a corresponding one or more of the secondary devices based on the type (Files are automatically redistributed and sorted to different locations in memory (i.e. different folders) based on a predefined criteria, paragraphs [0006], [0013] and [0014]; where the files can be sorted to a different location in memory based on the extension of each file as disclosed on paragraph [0022]).

It is noted that Cazier fails to explicitly disclose that content is distributed to one or more secondary devices. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Awbrey. In a similar field of endeavor Awbrey discloses that content is distributed to one or more secondary devices (When a portable digital music player with Auto-sync, i.e. iPod, is connected to a computer, music content is automatically downloaded into the memory of the portable device, where the portable digital music player includes a build-in FireWire port in order to connect to a computer, which makes it a plug and play device, page 1 paragraph 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cazier by specifically providing such element, as taught by Awbrey, for the purpose of saving space on the main computer that receives the content, since it contains a limited amount of memory, whereas an unlimited amount of external storage devices can be connected at different times.

Regarding **claim 43**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 41); in addition, claim 43 incorporates all the limitations of claim 10. Therefore, claim 43 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 10).

Regarding **claim 44**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as applied above (See claim 41); in addition, Awbrey discloses storing the digital information in the computing device until the corresponding one or more of the secondary devices is coupled to the computing device (The content that has been added to the computer is automatically added to the portable music player once it gets connected to the computer, page 1 paragraph 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cazier by specifically providing such element, as taught by Awbrey, for the purpose of automatically updating and transferring the new content, which allows the device to self update every time it gets connected to a computer, saving a lot of time to the user.

Regarding **claim 45**, Cazier discloses a method for routing digital information from a computing device to one or more secondary devices, comprising:

receiving the digital information having a type (A camera or storage transfers data, i.e. images to a computer or the internet once it gets connected, where meta data is used to sort the files; paragraph [0014] also exhibited on fig 1);

automatically sorting the digital information based on the type (A processor configured to sort a plurality of files (i.e. images), see claim 11 in reference; where the file extension can be used as a sorting criteria; more specifically, the files can be sorted to a different location in memory based on the extension of each file as disclosed on paragraph [0022])

automatically distributing the digital information to a corresponding one or more of the secondary devices based on the type (Files are automatically redistributed and sorted to different locations in memory (i.e. different folders) based on a predefined criteria, paragraphs [0006], [0013] and [0014]).

It is noted that Cazier fails to explicitly disclose that content is distributed to one or more secondary devices and automatically detecting the secondary devices. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Awbrey. In a similar field of endeavor Awbrey discloses that content is distributed to one or more secondary devices (When a portable digital music player with Auto-sync, i.e. iPod, is connected to a computer, music content is automatically downloaded into the memory of the portable device, page 1 paragraph 3)

Automatically detecting the secondary devices (where the portable digital music player includes a build-in FireWire port in order to connect to a computer, which makes it a plug and play device, page 1 paragraph 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cazier by specifically providing such element, as taught by Awbrey, for the purpose of saving space on the main computer that receives

the content, since it contains a limited amount of memory, whereas an unlimited amount

of external storage devices can be connected at different times.

Regarding **claim 47**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as above

(see claim 45); in addition, claim 47 incorporates all the limitations of claim 44.

Therefore, claim 47 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim

44).

Regarding **claim 48**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as applied

above (See claim 1); in addition, Awbrey discloses that the digital information is stored

on the storage device until the one or more secondary devices are available to receive

the digital information (The content that has been added to the computer is

automatically added to the portable music player once it gets connected to the

computer, page 1 paragraph 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify Cazier by specifically providing such element, as

taught by Awbrey, for the purpose of automatically updating and transferring the new

content, which allows the device to self update every time it gets connected to a

computer, saving a lot of time to the user.

Regarding **claim 49**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 12); in addition, claim 49 incorporates all the limitations of claim 48. Therefore, claim 49 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 48).

3.　　　**Claims 3, 4, 14 and 15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cazier in view of Awbrey further in view of Mercer et al (Patent No US 7,043,477). Hereinafter referenced as Mercer.

Regarding **claim 3**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as applied above (See claim 1); in addition, Cazier disclose that a computer receives the images or audio files from the camera, where the files are sorted in sub-directories located on the computer's storage, paragraphs [0003], [0006] and [0023].

It is noted that Cazier and Awbrey fail to explicitly disclose that the storage device is a hard disk drive. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Mercer. In a similar field of endeavor Mercer discloses that the storage device is a hard disk drive (A computer includes a hard disk drive [154] for storage, column 17 lines 48-64 also exhibited on figure 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cazier and Awbrey by specifically providing such element, as taught by Mercer, for the purpose of providing non-volatile storage that will store content.

Regarding **claim 4**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as applied above (See claim 1); in addition, Cazier disclose that a computer receives the images or audio files from the camera, where the files are sorted in sub-directories located on the computer's storage, paragraphs [0003], [0006] and [0023].

It is noted that Cazier and Awbrey fail to explicitly disclose that the storage device is a semiconductor memory. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Mercer. In a similar field of endeavor Mercer discloses that the storage device is a semiconductor memory (A computer includes a system memory [134] which consist of ROM [138] and RAM [140], column 17 lines 34-47 also exhibited on figure 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cazier and Awbrey by specifically providing such element, as taught by Mercer, for the purpose of providing volatile storage that will momentarily store or buffer data in order to allow a computer system to process information efficiently.

Regarding **claim 14**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 12); in addition, claim 14 incorporates all the limitations of claim 3. Therefore, claim 14 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 3).

Regarding **claim 15**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 12); in addition, claim 15 incorporates all the limitations of claim 4. Therefore, claim 15 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 4).

4.   **Claims 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 40, 42, 46, 50 and 51** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cazier in view of Awbrey further in view of Malek et al (Patent No US 6,253,207). Hereinafter referenced as Malek.

Regarding **claim 2**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as applied above (See claim 1); however, it is noted that Cazier and Awbrey fail to explicitly disclose that the digital information is downloaded from a server to the storage device. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Malek. In a similar field of endeavor Malek discloses that the digital information is downloaded from a server to the storage device (Server [120] may be embodied as a file server, a music server or a video server, column 4 lines 46-51 also exhibited on figures 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cazier and Awbrey by specifically providing such element, as taught by Malek, for the purpose of providing an external source of

information which has the potential to provide enormous amounts of data which can be requested by the user at any time.

Regarding **claim 6**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as applied above (See claim 1); in addition, Cazier disclose a processor configured to sort a plurality of files (i.e. images), see claim 11 in reference.

It is noted that Cazier and Awbrey fail to explicitly disclose that the controller utilizes a routing table to route the digital information. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Malek. In a similar field of endeavor Malek discloses that the controller utilizes a routing table to route the digital information (Network node [300] includes a processor [340], with a multimedia traffic handler [400] which routes data based on a routing table [500], column 6 lines 7-48 also exhibited on figures 3 - 5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cazier and Awbrey by specifically providing such element, as taught by Malek, for the purpose of providing an electronic table database that stores the routes to a particular network destination, which allows the transfer of data in a more secure and faster way.

Regarding **claim 7**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as applied above (See claim 6); in addition, Cazier discloses a processor configured to sort a plurality of files (i.e. images), see claim 11 in reference.

It is noted that Cazier and Awbrey fail to explicitly disclose that the routing table further comprises a file type column and a device column. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Malek. In a similar field of endeavor Malek discloses that the routing table further comprises a file type column and a device column (Routing table [500] includes a column for the type of data [560] and a virtual path identifier or destination identifier [550], column 1 lines 26-43 also exhibited on figures 5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cazier and Awbrey by specifically providing such element, as taught by Malek, for the purpose of providing an electronic table database that stores the routes to a particular network destination, which allows the transfer of data in a more secure and faster way.

Regarding **claim 8**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as applied above (See claim 6); in addition, Cazier discloses that the routing table utilizes meta data information within the digital information to route the digital information (The addition information, i.e. meta data, contained in files can be used to sort them into groups and distribute them to different folders in memory based on the user criteria, paragraph [0011], [0014] and [0015]).

Regarding **claim 9**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as applied above (See claim 6); in addition, Cazier discloses the routing table is user-defined (The user may choose a sorting criteria for the data, paragraph [0018]).

Regarding **claim 13**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 12); in addition, claim 13 incorporates all the limitations of claim 2. Therefore, claim 13 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 2).

Regarding **claim 17**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 12); in addition, claim 17 incorporates all the limitations of claim 6. Therefore, claim 17 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 6).

Regarding **claim 18**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 17); in addition, claim 18 incorporates all the limitations of claim 7. Therefore, claim 18 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 7).

Regarding **claim 19**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 17); in addition, claim 19 incorporates all the limitations of claim 8. Therefore, claim 19 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 8).

Regarding **claim 20**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as above
(see claim 17); in addition, claim 20 incorporates all the limitations of claim 9. Therefore,
claim 20 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 9).

Regarding **claim 22**, Cazier discloses an apparatus for automatically routing
digital media content from a computing device to one or more secondary devices
comprising:

an interface coupled to receive downloaded digital media content having a type
(A camera or storage transfers data, i.e. images to a computer or the internet once it
gets connected, where meta data is used to sort the files; paragraph [0014] also
exhibited on fig 1);

a storage device coupled to the interface to store the digital media content (A
computer receives the images or audio files from the camera, where the files are sorted
in sub-directories located on the computer's storage, paragraphs [0003], [0006] and
[0023]);

a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically distribute the digital
media content to the one or more secondary devices based on the type (A processor
configured to sort a plurality of files (i.e. images), see claim 11 in reference; moreover,
when a camera is connected to a computer, files are automatically redistributed and
sorted to different locations in memory (i.e. different folders) based on a predefined
criteria, such as the file extension, paragraphs [0006], [0013], [0014] and [0022]).

It is noted that Cazier fails to explicitly disclose a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically detect the one or more secondary devices. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Awbrey. In a similar field of endeavor Awbrey discloses a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically detect the one or more secondary devices (When a portable digital music player with Auto-sync, i.e. iPod, is connected to a computer, music content is automatically downloaded into the memory of the portable device, where the portable digital music player includes a build-in FireWire port in order to connect to a computer, which makes it a plug and play device, page 1 paragraph 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cazier by specifically providing such element, as taught by Awbrey, for the purpose of saving space on the main computer that receives the content, since it contains a limited amount of memory, whereas an unlimited amount of external storage devices can be connected at different times.

The combination of Cazier and Awbrey still fail to explicitly disclose a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically determine which type of media content is routed to which secondary device utilizing a routing table. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Malek. In a similar field of endeavor Malek discloses a controller coupled to the storage device to automatically determine which type of media content is routed to which secondary device utilizing a routing table (Network node [300] includes a processor [340], with a

multimedia traffic handler [400] which routes data based on a routing table [500],

column 6 lines 7-48 also exhibited on figures 3 - 5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify Cazier and Awbrey by specifically providing such

element, as taught by Malek, for the purpose of providing an electronic table database

that stores the routes to a particular network destination, which allows the transfer of

data in a more secure and faster way.

Regarding **claim 23**, Cazier, Awbrey and Malek disclose everything claimed as

above (see claim 22); in addition, claim 23 incorporates all the limitations of claim 2.

Therefore, claim 23 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 2).

Regarding **claim 26**, Cazier, Awbrey and Malek disclose everything claimed as

above (see claim 22); in addition, claim 26 incorporates all the limitations of claim 5.

Therefore, claim 26 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 5).

Regarding **claim 27**, Cazier, Awbrey and Malek disclose everything claimed as

above (see claim 22); in addition, claim 27 incorporates all the limitations of claim 7.

Therefore, claim 27 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 7).

Regarding **claim 28**, Cazier, Awbrey and Malek disclose everything claimed as
above (see claim 22); in addition, claim 28 incorporates all the limitations of claim 8.
Therefore, claim 28 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 8).

Regarding **claim 29**, Cazier, Awbrey and Malek disclose everything claimed as
above (see claim 22); in addition, claim 29 incorporates all the limitations of claim 9.
Therefore, claim 29 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 9).

Regarding **claim 30**, Cazier, Awbrey and Malek disclose everything claimed as
above (see claim 22); in addition, claim 30 incorporates all the limitations of claim 11.
Therefore, claim 30 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim
11).

Regarding **claim 31**, Cazier discloses a network of devices for automatically
routing digital information comprising:

a computing device coupled to the server for obtaining and routing the digital
information (A computer receives data, i.e. images or audio files, from an external
source, where files are automatically redistributed and sorted to different locations in
memory (i.e. different sub folders) based on a predefined criteria, paragraphs [0006],
[0013], [0014] and [0023]).

It is noted that Cazier fails to explicitly disclose one or more secondary devices coupled to the computing device for receiving the digital information from the computing device. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Awbrey. In a similar field of endeavor Awbrey discloses one or more secondary devices coupled to the computing device for receiving the digital information from the computing device (When a portable digital music player with Auto-sync, i.e. iPod, is connected to a computer, music content is automatically downloaded into the memory of the portable device, where the portable digital music player includes a build-in FireWire port in order to connect to a computer, which makes it a plug and play device, page 1 paragraph 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cazier by specifically providing such element, as taught by Awbrey, for the purpose of saving space on the main computer that receives the content, since it contains a limited amount of memory, whereas an unlimited amount of external storage devices can be connected at different times.

The combination of Cazier and Awbrey still fail to explicitly disclose a server including digital information. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Malek. In a similar field of endeavor Malek discloses a server including digital information (Server [120] may be embodied as a file server, a music server or a video server, where the multimedia traffic handler [400] routes data; column 4 lines 46-51 also exhibited on figures 1, 3 and 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cazier and Awbrey by specifically providing such element, as taught by Malek, for the purpose of providing an external source of information which has the capabilities of transmitting vast amounts of data to different users.

Regarding **claim 32**, Cazier, Awbrey and Malek disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 31); in addition, claim 32 incorporates all the limitations of claim 5. Therefore, claim 32 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 5).

Regarding **claim 33**, Cazier, Awbrey and Malek disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 31); in addition, claim 33 incorporates all the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, claim 33 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 1).

Regarding **claim 34**, Cazier, Awbrey and Malek disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 33); in addition, claim 34 incorporates all the limitations of claim 10. Therefore, claim 34 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 10).

Regarding **claim 37**, Cazier, Awbrey and Malek disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 31); in addition, Cazier discloses that the computing device is a personal computer (a computer receives data, i.e. images or audio files, from an

external source, where files are automatically redistributed and sorted to different

locations in memory (i.e. different sub folders) based on a predefined criteria,

paragraphs [0006], [0013], [0014] and [0023]).

Regarding **claim 40**, Cazier, Awbrey and Malek disclose everything claimed as

above (see claim 31); in addition, claim 40 incorporates all the limitations of claim 11.

Therefore, claim 40 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim

11).

Regarding **claim 42**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as above

(see claim 41); in addition, claim 42 incorporates all the limitations of claim 2. Therefore,

claim 42 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 2).

Regarding **claim 46**, Cazier and Awbrey disclose everything claimed as above

(see claim 45); in addition, claim 46 incorporates all the limitations of claim 2. Therefore,

claim 46 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim 2).

Regarding **claim 50**, Cazier, Awbrey and Malek disclose everything claimed as

above (see claim 22); in addition, claim 50 incorporates all the limitations of claim 48.

Therefore, claim 50 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim

48).

Regarding **claim 51**, Cazier, Awbrey and Malek disclose everything claimed as

above (see claim 31); in addition, claim 51 incorporates all the limitations of claim 48.

Therefore, claim 51 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim

48).

5.   **Claims 24, 25, 35, 36, 38 and 39** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Cazier in view of Awbrey further in view of Malek and further in view

of Mercer.

Regarding **claim 24**, Cazier, Awbrey and Malek disclose everything claimed as

above (see claim 22); it is noted that Cazier, Awbrey and Malek fail to explicitly disclose

that the storage device is a hard disk drive. However, the examiner maintains that it was

well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Mercer. In a similar field of

endeavor Mercer discloses that the storage device is a hard disk drive (A computer

includes a hard disk drive [154] for storage, column 17 lines 48-64 also exhibited on

figure 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify Cazier and Awbrey by specifically providing such

element, as taught by Mercer, for the purpose of providing non-volatile storage that will

store content.

Regarding **claim 25**, Cazier, Awbrey and Malek disclose everything claimed as

applied above (See claim 22); it is noted that Cazier, Awbrey and Malek fail to explicitly

disclose that the storage device is a semiconductor memory. However, the examiner

maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Mercer.

In a similar field of endeavor Mercer discloses that the storage device is a

semiconductor memory (A computer includes a system memory [134] which consist of

ROM [138] and RAM [140], column 17 lines 34-47 also exhibited on figure 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify Cazier and Awbrey by specifically providing such

element, as taught by Mercer, for the purpose of providing volatile storage that will

momentarily store or buffer data in order to allow a computer system to process

information efficiently.

Regarding **claim 35**, Cazier, Awbrey and Malek disclose everything claimed as

above (see claim 33); in addition, claim 35 incorporates all the limitations of claim 24.

Therefore, claim 35 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim

24).

Regarding **claim 36**, Cazier, Awbrey and Malek disclose everything claimed as

above (see claim 33); in addition, claim 36 incorporates all the limitations of claim25.

Therefore, claim 36 stands rejected for the same reasons as stated above (see claim

25).

Regarding **claim 38**, Cazier, Awbrey and Malek disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 33); it is noted that Cazier, Awbrey and Malek fail to explicitly disclose that the computing device is a set-top box. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Mercer. In a similar field of endeavor Mercer discloses that the computing device is a set-top box (Computer [130] can also be a set top box, column 19 lines 10-28 also exhibited on figure 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cazier and Awbrey by specifically providing such element, as taught by Mercer, for the purpose of providing more advertisement flexibility from a sales point of view, in other words, using a set top box as a data sorter would allow more marketability due to the additional functions that such device could be able to process.

Regarding **claim 39**, Cazier, Awbrey and Malek disclose everything claimed as above (see claim 33); it is noted that Cazier, Awbrey and Malek fail to explicitly disclose that the computer device further comprises a modem device for coupling to the server. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide such element, as taught by Mercer. In a similar field of endeavor Mercer discloses that the computer device further comprises a modem device for coupling to the server (Computer [130] includes a modem [178] for establishing communication over a network, column 18 lines 40-55 also exhibited on figure 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cazier and Awbrey by specifically providing such element, as taught by Mercer, for the purpose of providing a way to communicate to different remote server over long distances at reasonable speeds, which allows a user to transmit and receive data as needed.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments filed 05/30/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding independent **claims 1, 12, 22, 31, 41 and 45**, applicant claims that the combination of Cazier and Awbrey failed to present evidence of "automatic content routing by file type", where the applicant argues that Cazier is able to categorize only one type of file: an image file.

However, the examiner is not persuaded by the applicant's argument and maintains that Cazier discloses the feature above. For example, paragraph [0022] teaches that files can be sorted using different types of sorting criteria; for instance, files can be sorted by file extension, i.e. jpg, etc; where data (in this case image files) with different file extensions are indeed considered different "types" of files, since different file extensions refer to distinct data formats and encoding schemes.

Moreover, the applicant argues that the combination of Cazier and Awbrey do not teach an apparatus which is able to route digital information to an appropriate secondary device based on file type.

However, the examiner is not persuaded by the applicant's argument and maintains that the combination of Cazier and Awbrey disclose the feature above. For example, Cazier discloses an apparatus which routes information based on file type to a device, in this case a camera routes files to an external computer memory sector, i.e. folder, which receives the different types of files types sorted by file extension, i.e. jpg; paragraphs [0003] [0006] and [0023]. Moreover, Awbrey discloses a secondary device which is automatically detected in order to obtain files, in this case a portable digital data player with auto-sync properties, page 1 paragraph 3.

Conclusion

7.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to JUNIOR O. MENDOZA whose telephone number is

(571)270-3573. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9am - 5pm

EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Andrew Koenig can be reached on (571)272-7296. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Junior O Mendoza
Examiner
Art Unit 2623

/J. O. M./
August 27, 2008

/Andrew Y Koenig/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623